

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-25 and 27-29 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of June 8, 2010 all claims are rejected. With this response no claims are amended, added or cancelled. Applicant respectfully notes that the language of the claims used in the text of the Office Action does not track the actual language of the claims. For example, claim 1 recites “at least one video sequence” in various limitations, while the Office Action still states “at least one group of pictures.” Furthermore, claim 12 recites that the first and second transmission units are different from video coding units of the first and second encoded picture. However, the text of the Office Action states that the first identification sequence identification has the same value as the second video sequence identification sequence identification when the first and second encoded picture belong to the same group of pictures. However, this language is not the language from claim 12. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Office fully examine the language of the pending claims, and reflect that language in any further Office Actions issued by the Office.

Claim Rejections Under § 102

In section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-10, 12-16, 20-25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Yasuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,275). Applicant respectfully submits that Yasuda fails to disclose or suggest claim 1, because Yasuda fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Yasuda at least fails to disclose or suggest arranging encoded pictures in decoding order and that each picture of the at least one video sequence has a distinct video sequence identification separate from the picture identification associated to the picture, as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda.

Yasuda is directed to being able to provide smooth reverse playback of video by decoding video frames at regular intervals from the video stream. In order to solve the problem that the number of frames in the different GOPs is not known, Yasuda decodes the video stream to determine the number of pictures in a GOP, and then selects the pictures to be decoded to display in reverse order. However, Yasuda does not disclose or suggest arranging pictures in decoder order, because Yasuda only discloses that decoded pictures are read out in appropriate

order and output. See Yasuda column 8, lines 35-38. Instead, the appropriate order mentioned in Yasuda refers to display order, and therefore the pictures are read out in display order and not decoding order. Furthermore, Yasuda merely discloses a frame number, which is not a video sequence identification, but is instead a number indicating the display order. See Yasuda column 9, lines 53-56. While Yasuda also discusses analyzed GOP number, this number is only a temporary number assigned by the system in order to count the pictures correctly. Accordingly, Yasuda fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1, and claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda.

Independent claims 6 and 8-10 contain limitations similar to claim 1, and therefore for at least for the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, these independent claims are not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda.

The claims depending from the independent claims listed above are also not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda at least in view of their dependencies. Furthermore, with respect to claim 5, Yasuda is silent regarding identifiers, and therefore cannot disclose or suggest transmitting the video sequence identification and the picture identification on different layers. With respect to claim 7, since Yasuda is silent regarding video sequence identification, Yasuda does not disclose or suggest that the pictures of the video sequence include a video sequence identification that has the same value as the independently decodable picture of the video sequence.

In addition, claim 12 recites identifiers of transmission units. However, Yasuda only deals with encoded video and does not disclose any transmission units. GOPs in Yasuda are groups of pictures formed by the video encoder, and before they could be transmitted, appropriate encapsulation and/or packetization is needed depending on the type of transmission in question. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of a transmission unit configured for network transmission in Yasuda, since the GOP is a video coding unit. Accordingly, since Yasuda does not disclose transmission units it necessarily follows that Yasuda fails to disclose or suggest the composition or contents of transmission units. Therefore, for at least these reasons claim 12 is not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda.

Independent claims 16, 20-25 and 27-28 contain limitations similar to claim 12, and therefore for at least for the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 12, these independent claims are not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda.

The claims depending from the independent claims listed above are also not disclosed or suggested by Yasuda at least in view of their dependencies.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 7, on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yasuda in view of Bigham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,677,905). Claims 17 and 19 ultimately depend from independent claim 16, and Bigham fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Yasuda identified above. Therefore, claims 17 and 19 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 8, on page 8 of the Office Action, claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yasuda in view of Watkins (U.S. Publ. Appl. No. 2004/0039796). Claim 18 ultimately depends from independent claim 16, and Watkins fails to make up for the deficiencies in the teachings of Yasuda identified above. Therefore, claim 18 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8 Sept 2020



Keith R. Obert  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
USPTO Customer No. 004955